



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.  | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR   | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|------------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/591,784   | 12/12/2006  | Fathi Hassan Saleh     | SABC-0004           | 4283             |
| 23377 7590 09/19/2008<br>WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP<br>CIRA CENTRE, 12TH FLOOR<br>2929 ARCH STREET<br>PHILADELPHIA, PA 19104-2891 |             |                        |                     |                  |
| EXAMINER<br>WOOLCOCK, LENWORTH A   |             |                        |                     |                  |
| ART UNIT<br>2629   |             | PAPER NUMBER           |                     |                  |
| MAIL DATE<br>09/19/2008  |             | DELIVERY MODE<br>PAPER |                     |                  |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/591,784

**Applicant(s)**

SALEH ET AL.

**Examiner**

LENWORTH WOOLCOCK

**Art Unit**

2629

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 September 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/CDC)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date 02/23/2007.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Drawings***

Claimed subject matter not shown in the Drawings:

"nine flat screens"; "multiple projectors"; "multiple screens"; "PC"; "hanging platform"; "display system"; "a receiving set"

### ***Specification***

The abstract of the disclosure does not commence on a separate sheet in accordance with 37 CFR 1.52(b)(4). A new abstract of the disclosure is required and must be presented on a separate sheet, apart from any other text.

### ***Claim Objections***

Claims 1-25 are objected to because "each claim should begins with a capital letter and should ends with period" (see, MPEP 608.01 (m)).

Claims 1-25 are objected, because the use of parentheses in claims 1-25. "The reference characters, however, should be enclosed within parentheses so as to avoid confusion with other numbers or characters which may appear in the claims. The use of reference characters is to be considered as having no effect on the scope of the claims." Thus, **Parentheses is used only for character or numbers** . (see, MPEP 608.01 (m)).

Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 1 and 12 provides for the use of "Simple to operate and maintain"; Simple to install"; and Can run any kind of visual contents, both self running interactive"; and can be used in various applications like educational, technical and cultural", but, since the claim does not set forth any steps involved in the method/process, it is unclear what method/process applicant is intending to encompass. A claim is indefinite where it merely recites a use without any active, positive steps delimiting how this use is actually practiced.

Claims 1 and 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed recitation of a use, without setting forth any steps involved in the process, results in an improper definition of a process, i.e., results in a claim which is not a proper process claim under 35 U.S.C. 101. See for example *Ex parte Dunki*, 153 USPQ 678 (Bd.App. 1967) and *Clinical Products, Ltd. v. Brenner*, 255 F. Supp. 131, 149 USPQ 475 (D.D.C. 1966).

Claims 2-11 and 13-25 are rejected since they depend on rejected claims 1 and 12.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-5, 7-10, 12-16, 18-21, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by Hennes et al (US 6665985) in view of Slesak et al (US 2004/0033821).

Consider claims 1, and 12, Hennes discloses a portable system capable of displaying interactive computer programs on a large area using nine flat screens to build single seamless customizable panoramic screen, depends on traditional technology and have the following advantages: Simple to operate and maintain, simple to install, the shape and area of the display are easily customizable, can run any kind of visual contents, both self-running and interactive, can be used in various applications like educational, technical, promotional and cultural (**see abstract**), and is composed of: Multiple projectors (the projection set) those project the panoramic image on the receiving set (**see fig. 2, element 350**), multiple screens (the receiving set) those are arranged seamlessly in front of the projection set (**see fig. 2, element 170**), single PC that runs the computer programs and connects to the projection set through a signal processor (**see fig. 5a, element 520**), a hanging platform for the projection set that can

be easily installed (**see fig. 1, element 180**). Hennes does not specifically disclose connecting to the projection set through a number of VGA cards. Slesak discloses connecting multiple video outputs using multiple VGA cards (**see par. [0047]**).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Hennes, and connect multiple video outputs using multiple VGA cards, as taught by Slesak, thus allowing one PC to control multiple video outputs, as discussed by Slesak (**see par. [0044]**).

Consider claim 2 and 13, Hennes discloses the projection set is composed of multiple fixed projectors, each one projects a portion of the computer program on the opposite screen of the receiving set, resulting in seamless panoramic image of the computer program on the receiving set (**see fig. 2**). Hennes does not specifically disclose 9 projectors. It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to have eight projectors instead of nine, since the applicant has not disclosed that having exactly nine projectors solves any stated problem or is for any particular purpose and it appears that the invention would perform equally well with eight projectors.

Consider claim 3 and 14, Hennes discloses the receiving set can be easily customized to produce differently shaped panoramic displays (straight, circular, semicircular or any other shape) by adjusting the angle between each two successive screens (**see col. 5 line 61- col. 6 line 5**).

Consider claim 4 and 15, Hennes discloses the projection set can be adjusted to produce panoramic displays those cover different field of views in the horizontal and vertical direction (**see col. 5 line 61- col. 6 line 5**).

Consider claim 5 and 16, Hennes discloses the displaying system is composed of regular, available and easy-to-use technologies making It a low-cost panoramic displaying system **(see col. 1, lines 33-50)**.

Consider claim 7 and 18, Hennes discloses the PC is connected to the projection set and can run programs contain different types of visual contents **(see col. 6, lines 52-67)**. Hennes does not specifically disclose the projection set connected through five VGA cards, each can output to two projectors. Slesak discloses connecting a display system to a computer through VGA cards, each of which can output to two projectors **(see par. [0047])**. Hennes does not specifically disclose five VGA cards. It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to have the five VGA cards needed to support nine projectors if two projectors are used per vga card, since the applicant has not disclosed that having exactly five VGA cards solves any stated problem or is for any particular purpose and it appears that the invention would perform equally well with any number of VGA cards.

Consider claim 8 and 19, Hennes discloses the program can contain both self-running and interactive contents **(see col. 6 lines 27-67)**.

Consider claim 9 and 20, Hennes discloses the program have an extremely hi resolution (7200x600 or higher) **(see col. 5 lines 6-21)**.

Consider claim 10 and 21, Hennes discloses the displaying system can be used to display different types of contents like: Information, 2d and 3d animations, video, panoramic Images and real-time 3d graphics **(see col. 6 lines 52-67)**.

Consider claim 25, Hennes and Slesak discloses the limitations of claim 12. Hennes does not specifically disclose the hanging platform can be easily assembled and disassembled. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the hanging platform easily assembled and disassembled, since it has been held that making an old device portable or movable without producing any new and unexpected result involves only routine skill in the art. In re Lindberg, 93 USPQ 23 (CCPA 1952).

Claims 6 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by Hennes et al (US 6665985) in view of Slesak et al (US 2004/0033821) in further view of Hamagishi et al (US 2002/0030887).

Consider claim 6 and 17, Hennes and Slesak discloses the display system of claim 1 and 12. Hennes does not specifically disclose the display system can display stereoscopic content. Hamagishi discloses a projection system which can display stereoscopic content **(see abstract)**.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Hennes, and have the display system can display stereoscopic content, as taught by Hamagishi, thus allowing the user to view stereoscopic content without the use of glasses, as discussed by Hamagishi **(see par. [0009])**.



Claims 11, and 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by Hennes et al (US 6665985) in view of Slesak et al (US 2004/0033821) in further view of Metcalf et al (US US6669346).

Claim 11 and 22 discloses Hennes and Slesak discloses the receiving set of claim 1 and 12. Hennes does not specifically disclose the receiving set use flat screens to produce custom- shape panoramic display (linear, circular, semi-circular...). Metcalf discloses the receiving set use flat screens to produce custom- shape panoramic display (**see col. 14, lines 29-52 and fig. 4**).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Hennes, and have the receiving set use flat screens to produce custom- shape panoramic display, as taught by Metcalf, thus allowing for any shaped screen to be used while still maintaining quality, as discussed by Metcalf (**see col. 14, lines 29-52 and fig. 4**).

Consider claim 23, Hennes and Slesak discloses the limitations of claim 12. Hennes does not specifically disclose composed of multiple pop up flat screens those can be easily folded and unfolded. Metcalf discloses the receiving set composed of multiple pop up fiat screens those can be easily folded and unfolded (**see fig. 10 and col. 17 lines 42-54**).

Consider claim 24, Hennes and Slesak discloses the limitations of claim 12. Hennes does not specifically disclose the hanging platform can be easily adjusted to

have different projection sets. Metcalf discloses the hanging platform can be easily adjusted to have different projection sets (**see col. 13, lines 32-59**).

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LENWORTH WOOLCOCK whose telephone number is (571)270-5152. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30am - 6pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Amare Mengistu can be reached on 571-272-7674. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 10/591,784

Page 10

Art Unit: 2629

/Amare Mengistu/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2629